to the customer, and he could state, generally ending in the cutting contractors' paying their debts through the Bankruptcy and Insolvent Courts. His client had, some few years since, been victimized by one of these cheap contractors, and consequently this time took measures to defeat another attempt of the kind. The specification was more than explicitly drawn out, and the quantities given,—he, Mr. Bussell, seeing to the legal part of the contract; and he was indeed glad to say he had now got the plaintiff in that fix, that unless he instantly fulfilled his contract to the satisfaction of his client's surveyor, and to the very letter of the contract, the defendant would at once employ a respectable builder and hold Mr. Brown and his sureties liable to the whole cost of carrying out the work mentioned in the specification. The present claim was one of the most impudent actions ever brought, and he was glad to find that no lawyer had recommended the course pursued by the plaintiff. Mr. Bussell then called the surveyor who prepared the specification, and took out the quantities. That gentleman and two other witnesses proved that the work done was widely different from the contract, and that it was decidedly necessary to pull it all down and begin *de novo*. One of the witnesses, Mr. Cooper, a builder, said he was positive no one, to do justice to themselves and the employer, could do the work required under 120*l.* or 130*l.*

The JUDGE said he was satisfied from the evidence that the plaintiff had failed to perform his agreement, and, until he had done so, he was not entitled under the terms of the contract to a fraction of money. From what he had heard of the case, he would advise the plaintiff to fulfil his contract; for he had got into the hands of parties who would speedily teach him that if he had made a bad bargain he must stick to it, or it would be worse for him. Verdict for the defendant, with full costs.

THE HOUSES AND SHOPS OF OLD LONDON.*

DURING the reign of Charles I. the Protectorate, and the first few years of the reign of Charles II. till the Great Fire of 1666, a period to which we, in the present paper, confine our remarks, the street architecture of London underwent a most important change, notwithstanding the troubles of the period. In spite of the statutes of former reigns against the introduction of wood in London buildings, a portion still continued to be erected, disguised by plaster, and in some instances they were, in defiance of the Government and corporate authorities, built without even the above precaution. The illustration No. 44, which still exists in a court in Bell-yard, Fleet-street, although older than the time of Charles I. gives a fearful notion of the dangerous condition of a considerable portion of London before the Great Fire. The majority of the buildings of this period were, however, constructed in a substantial manner with brick, with but little attempt at decoration. The picturesque Elizabethan style, so far as the exterior of London houses was concerned, rapidly went out of use. The few examples which are still existing of buildings which seem to have been erected at about the commencement of the reign of Charles I. exhibit an arrangement of more purely classic mouldings and cornices than is found in the preceding reigns of Elizabeth and James I. The illustration No. 45 (nearly opposite St. Clement's Church, Strand) is a good specimen of the period now under notice. No. 46, near the above spot, is a less decorated but elegant example. The small engraving of houses in Gray's-inn, No. 47, and No. 48, the residence of our great Milton, in King-street, Westminster,† will serve as characteristic specimens of many London houses built during the reign of Charles I. until the "Fire." The high-pitched roofs, with two or more windows, which are met with in various parts of England of this time and of that of Charles II. are not generally met with in London. This in the City may be accounted for by the circumstance of the small extent of frontage being at one time exposed for the purpose of building.

In Gray's-inn-lane some houses of the date 1633 have roofs similar to illustration No. 49, which, at a moderate height afford more accommodation in the attics. Several roofs of this description are met with in various parts of London, and often are the means of fixing the dates of buildings.

In 1623, two years before the commencement of the reign of Charles I. in the month of October, a melancholy accident happened in the French ambassador's house in Blackfriars, when Drury, a Jesuit, preached in a large upper room, three stories high, to a congregation of 300 persons and upwards: the floor gave way, and above a hundred of his hearers were killed, and nearly the same number badly wounded and buried in the ruins.

On the year of the accession of Charles I. the citizens were obliged to lay aside the entry of the king into London in consequence of the raging of the plague, which in that one year in *the City and suburbs carried off* 35,470 *persons, besides upwards of* 18,000 *who died of other distempers.*

In the next year (1626), in the month of June, there happened so violent a storm of hail, rain, and wind, attended by thunder and lightning, that the churchyard walls of St. Andrew's, Holborn, and St. Botolf's, Bishopsgate-street, were blown down, and many corpses of those who had died of the plague were exposed to public view.

About 1628-30, an order was made by the Privy Council to confine the south side of Cheapside from the Old Change to Bucklersbury, then called Goldsmiths-row and Lombard-street, to the trade of Goldsmiths only.

In 1631, the streets of London became greatly incumbered with stalls and stands for the sale of various goods in defiance of the laws. Against this infringement the common council enacted,—"That no inhabitant whatever should presume to sell anything in the streets or lanes of the City on pain of forfeiting, for the first offence, twenty shillings; for the second, forty shillings; for the third, four pounds; and for each offence afterwards to be doubled."

In the year 1635, the number of hackney coaches having, in spite of the enactments of James I. greatly increased, they plied in the streets in the same manner as at the present time. But great inconvenience being found by their obstructing the common passages and rendering the streets dangerous (as the historians of the time say) to his Majesty and the nobility, a proclamation was issued on the 19th of January, strictly commanding,—"That after the 24th of June next ensuing no hackney-coach shall be used in the city of London or suburbs thereof other than by carrying of people to and from their habitations in the country, and that no person make use of a coach in this city except such persons as are capable of keeping four able horses fit for his majestie's service." The cause of these repeated enactments respecting hackney-coaches in London was, no doubt, in consequence of the deplorable condition of the streets, of the condition of which at the present day we can scarcely form an idea. Many of the streets and lanes were unpaved, and numbers only partially: the footpaths were mostly unraised and composed of shingle, into which the water from the roofs of houses would pour in torrents from the spouts and projections: these uncomfortable footpaths were defended here and there by posts, which, while they protected the wayfarer from carriages and such like dangers by day, were, no doubt, a great inconvenience to many in the then "darkness visible" of the London streets at night: the city gallants of this time, no doubt, exposed themselves to the greatest of the perils of the road, and so has originated the English practice of gentlemen placing ladies at the position (even in our well-flagged streets) farthest from the kerb.

During this sad period of troubles and disputes between the king, parliament, and citizens, the privy council sent an arbitrary letter in the king's name, commanding the lord mayor and aldermen to shut up all shops in Goldsmiths-row, Cheapside, and Lombard-street, which were not occupied by goldsmiths; which order was soon enforced by a decree of the dreaded court of Star Chamber: no attention was, however, paid to this order by the citizens.

Notwithstanding this and other contentions between the city and the court, the former prevailed on the king to grant them an extension of the charter of Henry VI.: besides provision for the preservation of the peace, &c. a grant is made of "Moorfields and West Smithfield, with liberty to hold fairs and markets in the said fields, with all tolls, profits, &c. thereto belonging;" to which grant is added this particular clause—

"*We, our heirs, or successors, will not erect or cause to be erected, nor will permit or give leave to any person or persons to erect and build a new one, or any messuages, houses, structures, edifices, in or upon the said field, called Inner Moor, or the field called Outward Moor, or the said field called* WEST SMITHFIELD, *but that the said separate fields and places be reserved, disposed, and continued to such like common and public uses, as the said fields heretofore and now are used, disposed, and converted to.*" The Londoners' play-fields, the Inner and Outer Moor, are, in spite of the above compact, now nearly covered with bricks and mortar: let us hope that the feelings which forced the removal of the cattle trade from West Smithfield will also prevent the converting this valuable breathing place in the centre of the populous city to any other purposes than the recreation and advantage of the public.

In the City charter, 7 Charles I. the shops of pawnbrokers would seem to have been first directed to be licensed, and leave given to "expose and hang in and over the streets, and ways, and alleys of the said city and suburbs of the same, signs and posts of signs affixed to their houses and shops, for the better finding out such citizens' dwellings, shops, arts, or occupations," &c.

In 1642, the Parliament being at that time in favour with the citizens, dreading the advance of the king's troops on London, ordered the London trained bands to be in readiness, and all the passages and avenues leading to the city to be fortified by posts, chains, and courts of guard. The citizens on that occasion were so alarmed that a great number of all sexes applied so diligently to work in the digging and carrying earth that their fortifications were soon accomplished. Early in the same year, the common council passed an Act for the better defence of the city by fortifying the same with outworks at certain places, and it was likewise enacted by the said common council, that all the passages and ways leading to the City should be shut up except those entering at Charing-cross, St. Giles-in-the-Fields, St. John's-street, Shoreditch, and Whitechapel; and that the exterior ends of the said streets should be fortified with breast works and turnpikes musket proof; that all the sheds and buildings contiguous to London Wall without be taken down; and that the City wall, with its bulwarks, be not only repaired and mounted with artillery, but that likewise divers new works be added to the same at places most exposed. For defraying the expense of these works the common council imposed eight-fifteenths in the several wards of the City, which was afterwards confirmed by an order of Parliament. In consequence of this the work was begun with the greatest alacrity, and prosecuted with such amazing despatch that an earthen rampart, or wall, with bastions, redoubts, &c. was in a short time erected round London and Westminster and the borough of Southwark. Yet notwithstanding this, and other heavy expenses, so great a spirit of opposition had the citizens at this time to the king, that they did not think themselves at all oppressed.

In 1643, the common council ordered their representatives to apply to Parliament for leave to take down the cross in Cheapside, and destroy all the superstitious figures thereon.

1644.—The trade of the City westward, by water, being greatly obstructed by the loyal

* See page 471.

† This house was for several years the residence of Milton. The tree shown in the front of the engraving is said to have been planted by the poet. The sketch was taken from the garden of the house formerly occupied by the celebrated Jeremy Bentham. There was formerly a communication between Milton's house and this garden. On the slab shown in the engraving the late Mr. Hazlitt had engraved the words, "Sacred to Milton, Prince of Poets."

For more information on PDF Compression and OCR go to ThePaperlessOffice.org